

Extended GHZ n -player games with classical probability of winning tending to 0

Michel Boyer*

Département IRO, Université de Montréal
C.P. 6128, succursale centre-ville,
Montréal (Québec) H3C 3J7 CANADA
(Dated: August 22, 2004)

In 1990, Mermin presented a n player “game” that is won with certainty with n spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ particles in a GHZ state, and that no classical strategy (or local theory) can win with probability higher than $\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2^{[n/2]}}$, thus establishing a new Bell inequality. This letter first introduces a class of arithmetic games containing Mermin’s and then gives a quantum strategy based on a generalized n party GHZ state that wins those games with certainty. It is then proved for a subclass of those games where each player is given a single bit of input that no classical strategy can win with probability higher than $\frac{\binom{n}{[n/2]}}{2^{n-1}}$; this is asymptotically $2\sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}}n^{-\frac{1}{2}}$, thus giving a new and stronger Bell type inequality.

PACS numbers: 03.67.-a, 03.65.Ud

Introduction. In 1990, Mermin [1] proposed a “gedanken experiment” with a Bell inequality [2] that gives an exponential ratio between expected values obtained in the quantum world and those obtainable in a local theory. That experiment can be viewed as a cooperative game with n players that are not allowed to intercommunicate but may share some random data: for $j \in [1..n]$, player j is given $x_j \in \{0, 1\}$ where $x = (x_j)$ is promised to be in P , the set of bitstrings whose Hamming weight $|x| = \sum_{j=1}^n x_j$ is even (in Mermin’s article, the sum is odd; what follows is *mutatis mutandis*); player j is required to output $y_j \in \{0, 1\}$; they win if the parity of $|y| = \sum_j y_j$ is that of $|x|/2$ i.e. if $(-1)^{|y| + \frac{|x|}{2}} = 1$.

Again *mutatis mutandis*, let the players share the GHZ [3] state $|\Phi_n^+\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}[|0^n\rangle + |1^n\rangle]$. Denoting σ_1 for σ_X and σ_2 for σ_Y and letting σ_{1+x} be $\otimes_j \sigma_{1+x_j}$ we readily check that if $|x| \equiv 2 \pmod{4}$ then $\sigma_{1+x}|\Phi_n^+\rangle = -|\Phi_n^+\rangle$ and if $|x| \equiv 0 \pmod{4}$ then $\sigma_{1+x}|\Phi_n^+\rangle = |\Phi_n^+\rangle$. Put differently

$$\sigma_{1+x}|\Phi_n^+\rangle = (-1)^{\frac{|x|}{2}}|\Phi_n^+\rangle \quad (1)$$

This means that if they measure $|\Phi_n^+\rangle$ with σ_{1+x} they get the parity of $\frac{|x|}{2}$: player j measures his state with σ_{1+x_j} to get a bit y_j ; $(-1)^{|y|} = (-1)^{\frac{|x|}{2}}$; they win! This is the original strategy.

In order to translate it into a strategy where measurements are performed in the standard basis we simply notice that: $\sigma_1 = H\sigma_3H$ and $\sigma_2 = -S^\dagger H\sigma_3HS$ where H is the Hadamard transform and $S = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & i \end{bmatrix}$. Measuring $|\Phi_n^+\rangle$ with σ_{1+x} if $|x|$ is even is thus measuring with $\sigma_3^{\otimes n} = \sigma_Z^{\otimes n}$ (Z is the standard basis) the state obtained from $|\Phi_n^+\rangle$ as follows

- if $x_j = 0$, player j applies H on his state
- if $x_j = 1$, player j applies HS on his state

This is the strategy as it is currently described in the quantum information community, with a final step: “player j measures his state in the standard basis” [4].

In order to compare with a local model, Mermin essentially considers random variables (X, Y, Λ) with $X = (X_j)$, $P[X = x] = 2^{1-n}$ for $x \in P$, $Y = (Y_j)$, the Y_j being $\{0, 1\}$ -valued and independent, Y_j depending on X_j and the shared variable Λ . Using an elegant argument, he shows that $2^{n-1} \langle (-1)^{|Y|+|X|/2} \rangle \leq 2^{[n/2]}$; i.e.

$$\langle (-1)^{|Y|+|X|/2} \rangle \leq 2^{[n/2]-n+1} = \frac{1}{2^{[n/2]-1}} \quad (2)$$

Compared to 1 with the quantum strategy, this bound gives an exponential ratio. However, the random variable $(-1)^{|Y|+|X|/2}$ takes only two values, 1 and -1 , 1 corresponding to “win” and -1 to “lose” and so

$$\langle (-1)^{|Y|+|X|/2} \rangle = P[\text{win}] - P[\text{lose}] = 2P[\text{win}] - 1$$

and (2) is equivalent to

$$P[\text{win}] \leq \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2^{[n/2]}} \quad (3)$$

a result that was subsequently derived independently using combinatorial methods in [4] which shows the bound is tight (8). This means that in terms of probabilities, the quantum strategy wins with a probability that is not even twice that of a well chosen classical strategy! This letter is meant to widen that gap, introducing “arithmetic games” that contain Mermin’s game, as well as an extension presented in [5], and that also contain extensions in an other direction that behave very nicely and for which the probability of winning with classical strategies tends to 0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

A n -player game modulo M with divisor D . Each of $n \geq 1$ players is given as input an integer $x_j \in [0..D-1]$ for some fixed integer $D \geq 2$ (the “divisor”); they are promised that D divides their sum, i.e.

$$\sum_{j=1}^n x_j \equiv 0 \pmod{D} \quad (4)$$

The answers the players are allowed to give are integers $y_j \in [0..M-1]$ for some other fixed integer $M \geq 2$ (the “modulo”). The game is won if their answers satisfy

$$\sum_{j=1}^n y_j \equiv \frac{\sum_j x_j}{D} \pmod{M} \quad (5)$$

We denote this game $G_{n,D,M}$. Game $G_{n,2,2}$ is Mermin’s n -player game. Games $G_{n,2^d,2}$ (divisor 2^d and modulo 2) were presented in [5]. We will be interested by the games $G_{n,2,2^m}$, i.e. with divisor $D = 2$ and modulo $M = 2^m$ but our quantum strategy works for any D and M . Let P be the set of the x in $[0..D-1]^n$ that satisfy (4) and W be the set of the (x, y) with $x \in P$ and $y \in Y = [0..M-1]^n$ that satisfy (5); let finally $W(x) = \{y \in Y \mid (x, y) \in W\}$ for $x \in P$: these are the outputs that win on input x .

The quantum strategy. For any integer M , we let $\omega_M = e^{2i\pi/M}$, the standard M -th primitive root of the unity. Knowing the game in advance, the n players have prepared the following generalized GHZ state

$$|\Phi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{M}} \sum_{k=0}^{M-1} |k\rangle^{\otimes n}$$

which they now share. For $0 \leq k < M$ and M' arbitrary (to be chosen appropriately later on) let

$$F_M |k\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{M}} \sum_{y=0}^{M-1} \omega_M^{ky} |y\rangle$$

$$S_{M'} |k\rangle = \omega_{M'}^k |k\rangle$$

where ky is the integer multiplication of k by y . F_M is the quantum Fourier transform [6] on $\mathbf{C}^{[0..M-1]}$. For instance, if $D = 2$ and $M = 2$, $F_M^\dagger = H$ and $S_{DM} = S_4 = S$. Now here is the strategy. Notice that for $D = 2$ and $M = 2$, it is exactly that of Mermin’s game as recalled in the introduction ($H = F_2^\dagger(S_4)^0$, $HS = F_2^\dagger(S_4)^1$).

1. Player j applies $(S_{DM})^{x_j}$ to his state
2. Player j applies $F_M^\dagger$ to his state
3. Player j measures his state in the standard basis $|0\rangle, \dots, |M-1\rangle$ to output y_j .

Given initial state $|\Phi\rangle$, using $(\omega_{DM})^D = \omega_M$, one checks immediately that the states after steps 1 and 2 are respectively:

1. $\frac{1}{\sqrt{M}} \sum_{k=0}^{M-1} \omega_M^{k \frac{\sum_{j=1}^n x_j}{D}} |k\rangle^{\otimes n}$
2. $\kappa \sum_{k, y_1 \dots y_n} \omega_M^{k \frac{\sum_{j=1}^n x_j}{D}} \omega_M^{-k \sum_{j=1}^n y_j} |y_1 \dots y_n\rangle \quad (6)$

with normalising factor $\kappa = (\sqrt{M})^{-(n+1)}$. The coefficient of $|y\rangle = |y_1, \dots, y_n\rangle$ in (6) is

$$\kappa \sum_{k=0}^{M-1} \omega_M^{k \left(\frac{\sum_{j=1}^n x_j}{D} - \sum_{j=1}^n y_j \right)}$$

and it is 0 unless $\sum_{j=1}^n y_j \equiv \frac{\sum_{j=1}^n x_j}{D} \pmod{M}$, i.e. unless $y \in W(x)$, in which case it is κM and all the coefficients of $|y\rangle$ for $y \in W(x)$ are then equal; state (6) is thus

$$\frac{1}{|W(x)|^{\frac{1}{2}}} \sum_{y \in W(x)} |y\rangle$$

(because the $|y\rangle$ are orthonormal). When the players measure in step 3, they get with certainty $|y\rangle$ such that $y \in W(x)$ and collectively win the game without any need to intercommunicate.

Quantum pseudo-telepathy games. Our notations come from [4, 7]. Those are n player cooperative games G where intercommunication is disallowed and such that: (1) there is a quantum strategy that wins with certainty, (2) there is no classical strategy that wins with certainty. A classical (i.e. non quantum) strategy $\mathcal{S}$ is *deterministic* if each player j returns a predetermined output $\mathcal{S}_j(x_j)$ on input x_j [10]; we denote $\tilde{\omega}(G)$ the maximum rate of success of all the deterministic strategies; letting $\mathcal{S}(x) = (\mathcal{S}_j(x_j))$, it is

$$\tilde{\omega}(G) = \max_{\mathcal{S}} \frac{|\{x \in P \mid \mathcal{S}(x) \in W(x)\}|}{|P|}$$

A strategy is *probabilistic* if the players may also access a shared random value s and $\mathcal{S}(x, s) = (\mathcal{S}_j(x_j, s))$ [11]; we write $P_{\mathcal{S}}[\text{win} \mid x]$ for $P[\{s \mid \mathcal{S}(x, s) \in W(x)\}]$ and define

$$\omega(G) = \max_{\mathcal{S}} \min_{x \in P} P_{\mathcal{S}}[\text{win} \mid x] \quad (7)$$

One shows easily that $\omega(G) \leq \tilde{\omega}(G)$ [7]. A game is a pseudo-telepathy game if and only if it has a quantum winning strategy and $\tilde{\omega}(G) < 1$. Bound (3) and its tightness can now be stated precisely [8] [12]: if $n \geq 1$

$$\omega(G_{n,2,2}) = \tilde{\omega}(G_{n,2,2}) = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2^{\lceil n/2 \rceil}} \quad (8)$$

The $G_{n,D,M}$ games and pseudo-telepathy. First, the game $G_{n,D,M}$ is not a pseudo-telepathy game if $\gcd(D, M) = 1$. Indeed Bezout’s theorem implies that there is then $a \in [0..M-1]$ such that $aD \equiv 1 \pmod{M}$. If player j answers $\mathcal{S}_j(x_j) = ax_j \pmod{M}$ where $x \pmod{M}$ stands for $x - M \lfloor x/M \rfloor$ then for $x \in P$

$$\sum_j \mathcal{S}_j(x_j) \equiv a \sum_j x_j \equiv aD \frac{\sum_j x_j}{D} \equiv \frac{\sum_j x_j}{D} \pmod{M}$$

and $\mathcal{S}(x) = (\mathcal{S}_j(x_j))$ wins the game on all valid inputs.

If $\gcd(D, M) \neq 1$ then $G_{n,D,M}$ is a pseudo-telepathy game if $n \geq \max(3, p)$ where p is the smallest common prime factor of M and D . Let indeed $D = pD'$ and $M = pM'$ and let us assume $\mathcal{S}$ is a deterministic winning strategy for $G_{n,D,M}$; we want to derive a contradiction. Let $\mathcal{S}'_j(x_j) = \mathcal{S}_j(D'x_j) \pmod{p}$. If $\sum_j x_j \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ then $\sum_j D'x_j \equiv 0 \pmod{D}$ and by assumption

$$\sum_j \mathcal{S}_j(D'x_j) \equiv \frac{\sum_j D'x_j}{D} \equiv \frac{\sum_j x_j}{p} \pmod{pM'}$$

and, since $x \equiv y \pmod{pM'}$ implies $x \equiv y \pmod{p}$

$$\sum_j \mathcal{S}'_j(x_j) \equiv \frac{\sum_j x_j}{p} \pmod{p}$$

and $\mathcal{S}'$ is then a winning strategy for $G_{n,p,p}$. Let now $j_1, j_2 \in [1..n]$ be any two players; then $\mathcal{S}'_{j_1}(1) - \mathcal{S}'_{j_1}(0) \equiv \mathcal{S}'_{j_2}(1) - \mathcal{S}'_{j_2}(0) \pmod{p}$; we can see this by giving all the other players inputs so that the overall total is p (we need $n \geq 3$). This means there is some $d \in [0..p-1]$ such that $\mathcal{S}'_j(1) - \mathcal{S}'_j(0) \equiv d \pmod{p}$ for all players j . On the other hand if we choose $x_j = 1$ for $1 \leq j \leq p$ and 0 otherwise, their sum is p and $\sum_{j=1}^p \mathcal{S}'_j(1) + \sum_{j=p+1}^n \mathcal{S}'_j(0) \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$. If we choose all $x_j = 0$ their sum is 0 and $\sum_{j=1}^n \mathcal{S}'_j(0) \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$. Subtracting those two identities leaves

$$\sum_{j=1}^p [\mathcal{S}'_j(1) - \mathcal{S}'_j(0)] \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$$

i.e. $pd \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$. This implies that p divides 1 and gives the desired contradiction. Written differently, $\tilde{\omega}(G_{n,D,M}) < 1$ if $n \geq \max(3, p)$.

We now select a subclass of those games that give a better bound than (8).

A bound on classical strategies. From now on we consider only the games $G_{n,2,2^m}$ with $m \geq 1$; the divisor D is 2, the modulo is a power of 2. The inputs $x \in [0..D-1]^n$ are consequently bitstrings of length n and the promise is that $|x| = \sum_{j=1}^n x_j$ is even; $|P|$, the number of possible inputs, is thus 2^{n-1} . We now show that if $\lceil n/2 \rceil < 2M$ with $M = 2^m$ then any classical strategy wins on at most $\binom{n}{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}$ inputs or, equivalently, for $n \geq 1$

$$\tilde{\omega}(G_{n,2,2^m}) \leq \frac{\binom{n}{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}}{2^{n-1}} \quad \text{if } m \geq \ell(n) \quad (9)$$

where $\ell(n) = \lfloor \lg((n+1)/4) \rfloor + 1$. Let indeed $\mathcal{S}$ be any fixed deterministic strategy; since x_j is either 0 or 1

$$\sum_{j=1}^n \mathcal{S}_j(x_j) = \sum_{j=1}^n [\mathcal{S}_j(0)(1 - x_j) + \mathcal{S}_j(1)x_j]$$

If we let $d_j = \mathcal{S}_j(1) - \mathcal{S}_j(0)$ and $b = \sum_{j=1}^n \mathcal{S}_j(0)$, we get

$$\sum_{j=1}^n \mathcal{S}_j(x_j) = \sum_{j=1}^n d_j x_j + b$$

Strategy $\mathcal{S}$ wins on input x if and only if $\sum_{j=1}^n d_j x_j + b \equiv \frac{\sum_{j=1}^n x_j}{2} \pmod{M}$ or, equivalently, if and only if

$$\sum_{j=1}^n (2d_j - 1)x_j \equiv -2b \pmod{2M} \quad (10)$$

We now use a theorem of Griggs [9]: *Let $q > 0$ be any integer and $a_1, \dots, a_n$ be integers that have no common*

factor with q (i.e. $\gcd(a_j, q) = 1$). Let E be any subset of r elements of $[0..q-1]$. Then the number of strings $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$ such that $\sum_{j=1}^n a_j x_j$ is congruent modulo q to some element in E is at most $\sum_{j=\lceil (n-r)/2 \rceil}^{\lceil (n+r)/2 \rceil - 1} \binom{n}{j}_q$ where $\binom{n}{j}_q$ is the number of bitstrings $s \in \{0, 1\}^n$ such that $|s| \equiv j \pmod{q}$, and this bound is tight.

Letting q be $2M$ and $a_j = 2d_j - 1$, a_j is odd and consequently relatively prime with $q = 2M = 2^{m+1}$. The theorem applies to (10) and the number of winning inputs (r being 1) is at most $\binom{n}{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}_{2M}$ which is equal to $\binom{n}{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}$ as soon as $\lceil n/2 \rceil < 2M$ i.e. $m \geq \ell(n)$. This proves our claim [13]. From now on $\lceil n/2 \rceil < 2M$ with $M = 2^m$.

An optimal probabilistic strategy. The game is to halve $|x|$ i.e. the number of ones in the bitstring x , the players giving their answers using m bit integers. With unary representation, it makes sense to halve using random methods. This is the intuition behind the following strategy. Let

$$S = \{s \in \{0, 1\}^n \text{ s.t. } |s| \text{ has the same parity as } \lfloor n/2 \rfloor\}$$

where $|s| = \sum_{j=1}^n s_j$; $|S| = 2^{n-1}$. We now define the probabilistic strategy $\mathcal{S}$ as follows: the players draw randomly (with equal probability) $s \in S$ (in fact, they have drawn beforehand and just look up what they have drawn [14]) and then use the deterministic strategy $\mathcal{S}^s$ where $\mathcal{S}^s(x) = \mathcal{S}(x, s) = (\mathcal{S}_j(x_j, s))$ is such that:

Player j answers $\mathcal{S}_j(x_j, s) = s_j x_j$ for $2 \leq j \leq n$

Player 1 answers $\mathcal{S}_1(x_1, s) = s_1 x_1 + (\lfloor n/2 \rfloor - |s|)/2 \pmod{M}$

The winning condition. By definition, $\mathcal{S}^s(x) \in W(x)$ ($\mathcal{S}^s$ wins on input x) if and only if

$$\sum_{j=1}^n s_j x_j + (\lfloor n/2 \rfloor - |s|)/2 \equiv |x|/2 \pmod{M}$$

or equivalently $|s| + |x| - 2 \sum_{j=1}^n s_j x_j \equiv \lfloor n/2 \rfloor \pmod{2M}$ which holds if and only if

$$|s \oplus x| = \lfloor n/2 \rfloor \quad (11)$$

where $s \oplus x$ is the exclusive or of the bitstrings s and x (or equivalently their sum in $(\mathbf{Z}/2\mathbf{Z})^n$) and strict equality must occur because $0 \leq |s \oplus x| \leq n$ and $\lceil n/2 \rceil < 2M$ [15].

Let Ω be the set of strings $w \in \{0, 1\}^n$ such that $|w| = \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$; $|\Omega| = \binom{n}{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}$ and by (11) for all $x \in P$, $s \in S$

$$\mathcal{S}^s(x) \in W(x) \iff x \oplus s \in \Omega \quad (12)$$

Proportion of winning inputs. For any $s \in S$, the proportion of winning inputs x for $\mathcal{S}^s$ is the number of those $x \in P$ such that $\mathcal{S}^s(x) \in W(x)$ divided by $|P|$, and by (12), since $x \oplus s = w$ iff $x = s \oplus w$, it is

$$\frac{|\{s \oplus w \mid w \in \Omega\}|}{|P|} = \frac{\binom{n}{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}}{2^{n-1}}$$

According to (9) this is the maximum possible and so

$$\tilde{\omega}(G_{n,2,2^m}) = \frac{\binom{n}{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}}{2^{n-1}} \quad \text{if } n \geq 1 \text{ and } m \geq \ell(n)$$

Probability of winning on input x . For any $x \in P$, $P_S[\text{win} \mid x]$ i.e. $P[\{s \mid \mathcal{S}(x, s) \in W(x)\}]$ is simply the proportion of the strategy strings $s \in S$ such that $\mathcal{S}(x, s) \in W(x)$. Using again (12) this probability is

$$P_S[\text{win} \mid x] = \frac{|\{x \oplus w \mid w \in \Omega\}|}{|S|} = \frac{\binom{n}{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}}{2^{n-1}} \quad (13)$$

which must then also be $\min_{x \in P} P_S[\text{win} \mid x]$. By (7) this gives a lower bound for $\omega(G_{n,2,2^m})$; by $\omega(G) \leq \tilde{\omega}(G)$ and (9) it is also an upper bound and so for $n \geq 1$, $m \geq \ell(n)$

$$\omega(G_{n,2,2^m}) = \tilde{\omega}(G_{n,2,2^m}) = \frac{\binom{n}{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}}{2^{n-1}} \quad (14)$$

An asymptotic bound. Using Stirling formula $n! \sim (2\pi)^{\frac{1}{2}} n^{n+\frac{1}{2}} e^{-n}$ we obtain for $n = 2k$

$$\frac{\binom{2k}{k}}{2^{2k-1}} = \frac{(2k)!}{2^{2k-1} k! k!} \sim 2(\pi k)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$$

For $n = 2k + 1$ we have $\binom{2k+1}{k} = \frac{2k+1}{k+1} \binom{2k}{k}$ and thus $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\binom{2k+1}{k}/2^{2k}}{\binom{2k}{k}/2^{2k-1}} = 1$ which implies that

$$\omega(G_{n,2,2^{\ell(n)}}) = \tilde{\omega}(G_{n,2,2^{\ell(n)}}) \sim 2\sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \quad (15)$$

with $\ell(n) = \lfloor \lg((n+1)/4) \rfloor + 1$, the minimum length of the binary numbers to be used as answers by the players.

Conclusion. First, we have extended the class of known pseudo-telepathy games. Then, considering the class of n player games modulo 2^m and divisor 2 with $n \geq 1$ and $m \geq \ell(n)$, we have much improved the proven gap (8) between what can be done quantumly and classically: the optimal probability (14) that n players win our one bit of input games with classical means tends to 0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$. We exhibited a quantum strategy that works for any divisor D and any modulo M . The simplicity of our classical analysis for $D = 2$ and $M = 2^m$ may depend on the simplicity of bitstrings; it is as yet unclear how our method could be extended to trits ($D = 3$, $M = 3^m$).

On a practical basis, the bound depends only on the number of players as soon as the surprisingly weak condition $m \geq \ell(n)$ or equivalently $\lfloor n/2 \rfloor < 2^{m+1}$ is met; this means that we essentially win at least one bit over what we would naturally expect. Indeed, with a 2 bit implementation, i.e. $m = 2$, we get $\lfloor n/2 \rfloor < 2^3$ iff $n \leq 14$; with $n = 14$, the integer “halves” go from 0 to 7 and not from 0 to 3, but as we have seen not only in the proof of the bound but also in the independent proof of (11) and

(12), residues modulo 4 give the same bound. This gain may be useful: not only do we need m bit answers, but we also need to implement the quantum strategy, and in particular the Fourier transforms, on m qubits. We need $n = 7$ ($m = 2$) to beat Mermin’s bound, $n = 9$ ($m = 2$) to go below 50% and $n = 41$ ($m = 4$) to go below 25% of winning inputs.

Insightful comments from Anne Broadbent are gratefully acknowledged.

* Electronic address: boyer@iro.umontreal.ca

- [1] D. N. Mermin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **65**, 1838 (1990).
- [2] J. S. Bell, Physics **1** (1965).
- [3] D. M. Greenberger, M. Horne, and A. Zeilinger, in *Bell’s theorem, quantum theory and conceptions of the universe*, edited by M. Kafatos (Kluwer Academic Publishers Group, Dordrecht, 1989), pp. 69–72.
- [4] G. Brassard, A. Broadbent, and A. Tapp, in *Proceedings of the 8th International Workshop on Algorithms and Data Structures*, edited by F. Dehne, J. R. Sack, and M. Smid (2003), vol. 2748 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Sciences*, pp. 1–11. [quant-ph/0306042](https://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0306042).
- [5] H. Buhrman, P. Høyer, S. Massar, and H. Röhrig, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91** (2003).
- [6] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum computation and quantum information* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000).
- [7] G. Brassard, A. Broadbent, and A. Tapp, *Quantum pseudo-telepathy* (to appear). [quant-ph/0407221](https://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0407221).
- [8] A. L. Broadbent, Master’s thesis, DIRO, Université de Montréal (2004).
- [9] J. R. Griggs, Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society **28**, 329 (1993). [math.NT/9304211](https://arxiv.org/abs/math.NT/9304211).
- [10] For $G_{n,D,M}$ games a deterministic strategy $\mathcal{S}$ is identified to n functions $\mathcal{S}_j : [0 \dots D-1] \rightarrow [0 \dots M-1]$ for $j \in [1 \dots n]$.
- [11] We include in s the random generators (if any) of all players so that $\mathcal{S}^s$ defined by $\mathcal{S}^s(x) = \mathcal{S}(x, s)$ is deterministic for all s .
- [12] The proof that $\omega(G_{n,2,2}) = \tilde{\omega}(G_{n,2,2})$ is not trivial.
- [13] If M were not a power of 2, there would be no way to prevent the players from choosing a_j that are factors of $2M$. For instance, if M is 22, and the players choose $d_j = 6$ and so $a_j = 11$, then $\sum_j a_j x_j \equiv 11|x| \pmod{44}$ which is 0 (mod 44) if $|x|/2$ is even and 22 (mod 44) if $|x|/2$ is odd, and there results a strategy with more than 50% of winning inputs: player 1 answers 11 if $x_1 = 0$ and 17 otherwise whilst the other players answer 0 if $x_j = 0$ and 6 otherwise. The same reasoning applies for every $M = 2(2r+1)$, $r \geq 1$, giving 50% or more of winning inputs.
- [14] Each player needs only keep 1 bit s_j for each round of the game except for player 1 who needs both s_1 and $|s|$. Choosing s implies no communication (after the game is started).
- [15] The distance between $|s \oplus x|$ and $\lfloor n/2 \rfloor$ is always less than $2M$: $|s \oplus x| - \lfloor n/2 \rfloor \leq n - \lfloor n/2 \rfloor \leq \lceil n/2 \rceil < 2M$ and $|0 - \lfloor n/2 \rfloor| = \lfloor n/2 \rfloor < 2M$.